Volume I Pages 1-80

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

No. 1:17-cv-10107-WGY

DAVID SETH WORMAN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CHARLES D. BAKER, et al.,

Defendants.

DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL HALPIN

Friday, September 15, 2017 at 9:40 a.m.

Campbell, Campbell, Edwards & Conroy

One Constitution Center

Boston, Massachusetts 02129

C. J. REPORTING
P.O. Box 1373
Andover, MA 01810
617.763.1725
www.cjreporting.com

C.J. Reporting 617.763.1725

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

```
What I would like to do here is go
Exhibit 2.
through and just confirm. Have you seen these
responses before?
         Yes, I have.
    Α.
          And what I would like to do is go through
and confirm the current status of most of these
responses to make sure nothing has changed since
they were originally signed. I think the best way
to do it is go through one by one here.
               If you can take a look at the first
interrogatory, it asks for incidents in which banned
firearms or magazines have been used to commit a
crime in Massachusetts. If you look at Page 3, the
response there at the top is that after a number of
objections: "Without limitation, the Colonel states
that the murder of seven individuals on December 26,
2000 in Wakefield, Massachusetts at Edgewater
Technology, Inc., was committed with guns that
appear to have included a banned AKA 47 copycat."
               Am I correct that the Massachusetts
State Police does not maintain comprehensive records
regarding the number of crimes that have been
committed?
    Α.
         We do not aggregate them. We do have
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

access to incident reports and other specific documents -- case-specific documents that would help you indicate that, but we don't aggregate or collect that information as a statistic. No database is maintained of a general information? Α. Correct. The only closest thing we would have to that is we have an arrest log. It wouldn't necessarily give you the precise answer to this question. It would be all crimes, and the information is, were they arrested, what their charge was and their address. That's the public kind of log information that's collected, and that's all kind of -- that would only show you what they were arrested for. If there were charges amended or whatever brought later, that would be in a different record. Essentially it would be the reporting Q. officer's log of what the initial charges were? The reporting officer does an incident report, usually. The arrest log is something different. That's a database collected by the

department. We have what's called an administrative

- 1 A. I would say they should be, and generally, 2 yes.
  - Q. As we sit here today, you're not aware of any incidents in which a banned firearm or magazine was used in a shooting that was determined to be in self-defense?
  - A. I am not.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

- Q. If you can go on to Interrogatory No. 4, it asked for investigations, arrests, or convictions of persons for a possession of a banned firearm or magazine, and the Colonel's response is the incident marked in Interrogatory No. 1 that we discussed. Do you have any additional information that would be responsive to that interrogatory?
  - A. No.
- Q. The next interrogatory asked for the identity of person or persons responsible for or participated and determined whether a particular firearm is a copy or duplicate of an enumerated banned firearm.
- After objections, the Colonel's response is he's unaware of any persons employed with the Massachusetts State Police who were responsible for development of the Attorney

```
General's Enforcement Notice. Is that accurate?
 1
 2
               Yes, I believe it is.
 3
               As we sit here today, are you aware of
    anyone that was involved?
 4
 5
         Α.
               No, I am not.
 6
               The next interrogatory asks for any person
 7
    or persons responsible for participating in the
 8
    preparing of a list of guns that are not assault
    weapons and related questions and answers published
 9
10
    by the Attorney General.
11
                    Are you familiar with the list of
12
    guns that are not assault weapons and the related
1.3
    questions and answers that are currently on the
14
    Attorney General's website?
15
               Yes, I am familiar with it.
         Α.
               The Colonel's response is that he's not
16
17
    aware of anyone that was responsible or participated
18
    in a substantial way with the creation of that list
19
    and the answers to the questions. Is that accurate
2.0
    as we sit here today?
2.1
         Α.
               Yes.
22
               The next interrogatory asks for the person
23
    or persons responsible for the 2016 review that led
    the Attorney General to issue the Notice of
24
```

```
1
    limited to the Notice of Enforcement.
                    And the Colonel's response here is
2
    that no particular person at the Massachusetts State
 3
 4
    Police is responsible for responding to such
 5
    questions, but a number of Massachusetts State
 6
    Police personnel could receive random inquiries to
 7
    which they would respond. So I have a number of
8
    questions about that.
                    Number one, are individual
9
10
    Massachusetts State Police Troopers or Officers
11
    permitted to answer questions about the scope of
    this law?
12
              We generally discourage our officers from
1.3
14
    giving out legal advice to people; that being said,
15
    you know, we have 2,300-plus members, and when
    citizens come in and ask questions, I think they do
16
17
    try to be as helpful as they can.
18
                    If a matter is very clear and can be
19
    explained to somebody, I think they will sometimes
20
    offer a piece of advice. Sometimes they will direct
    them to other people within the agencies.
2.1
22
    sometimes get people referred from a barracks to the
23
    legal section and we generally tell people, We're
24
    not your lawyers, we can't give you legal advice.
```

That's all meant to prevent, you know, somebody 1 2 violating the law and using the department as the 3 justification for why they did what they did. So we generally discourage it, both 4 5 our civilians and our uniform members from giving what we could consider legal advice. 6 7 Are you aware of any inquiries that have Q. come in to anyone within the Massachusetts State 8 Police about the scope of the challenged laws or the 9 10 Notice of Enforcement? 11 Α. I am not. Hopefully that will streamline the rest of 12 what we're going to go through here today since we 1.3 14 did that up front. 15 What I want to talk to you about right now are some of the attributes of the banned 16 17 firearms and banned magazines. And just so we're 18 clear, when I refer to banned firearms, I'm talking 19 about firearms that are banned under Massachusetts 20 law as either assault weapons, copies or duplicates or that failed the features test that's incorporated 2.1 22 in federal law. Does that make sense to you? 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. Does the Massachusetts State Police have a

```
1
    crime but to hopefully prevent it.
 2
                    But this particular function was
 3
    given to the Fusion Center to read a report of the
    end of each year specifying, you know, pursuant to
 4
 5
    what was submitted by local law enforcement and the
    State Police certain statistics on firearms and
 6
 7
    firearms activity.
 8
               So this report represents then an
    accumulation of data by the law enforcement agencies
 9
10
    throughout Massachusetts, at least those who have
11
    participated in this?
                     Again, it's a little bit like the
12
    RAM system. It's dependent on the participation of
1.3
14
    those providing the data.
15
               Do you know if all law enforcement
         Q.
    agencies are required to participate?
16
               I believe I would have to look
17
    specifically, if I may. I think MGL 140, Section
18
19
    131Q. The statute does say "shall" and requires all
20
    licensing authorities to report statistical data.
               So theoretically there should be a
2.1
         Ο.
22
    comprehensive report?
23
         Α.
              Yes.
24
         Q.
               If I could turn your attention to Page 5,
```

```
1
    which is Bates numbered AGO015307. In the third
 2
    paragraph on that page it states that: "In 2016,
 3
    shotguns and rifles accounted for 13 percent or 178
    guns, and assault rifles comprised 1.5 percent or 22
 4
 5
    guns of the total crime guns seized." Do you see
    that?
 6
 7
         Α.
              Yes.
               Do you know what it means when it says
 8
    "total crime guns seized"?
 9
10
               I'm a little embarrassed to say, maybe I
11
    don't.
               I didn't either. Don't feel embarrassed.
12
               I have what I believe to be an
1.3
14
    understanding of it, but I think, again, the crime
15
    guns refers to, I believe, any weapon that is
    required to be statistically reported on.
16
    that's what that reference means, but I didn't
17
18
    produce this report and I didn't write the report
19
    and I would qualify my answer as saying that's my
2.0
    understanding of what it is.
               So we don't know whether the guns that
2.1
22
    were seized were used in a violent crime or whether
23
    there was a possessory offense and they were seized
24
    as a result of that?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

I believe that would be true. that's my understanding. My understanding is that the statistics are of all weapons seized regardless of the circumstances. So my belief would be that crime gun seized just means it was seized because it was either unlawfully possessed, potentially used in a crime, whatever it gets reported. That would be my understanding of it. Who would know exactly what that includes? I think Lieutenant Zani presently -- Alan Α. Zani presently runs the crime gun unit. subordinates and his superiors at the Division of Investigative Services would be the people who had a hand in drafting and authorizing this document, would probably be better equipped to answer that. And this document comes out every year? 0. It has since I believe 2015 or '16. not even sure. I think it was -- there may have been one in '14. I know the first years were pretty sparse and incomplete because of the logistics surrounding reporting from everyone and getting that centralized diffusion, so I don't recall if it was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

```
He may have. He's potentially an end user
of that data, not somebody that's involved in the
logistics of it, but I think he may be able to shed
more light on it than I can.
               MR. PORTER: Excuse me, just a
reminder to let Mr. Nardone finish before you start,
just for the benefit of the court reporter.
               MR. NARDONE: Thank you.
BY MR. NARDONE:
          In that same paragraph it states that
under --
               MR. PORTER: Can you identify it for
the record?
         On Page 5 of what has been marked as
Exhibit No. 6, in the third paragraph of Page 5 it
states that in 2016 assault rifles comprised 1.5
percent of total crime guns seized, and in 2015
those percentages -- the percentage for assault
rifles was .75 percent. To your knowledge, are
those numbers accurate?
          I have no knowledge of the accuracy of the
        Again, my belief is it's what's reported.
numbers.
The department -- I have no reason to disbelieve the
department received those statistical numbers.
```

```
be more difficult or less difficult than others but
 1
 2
    it's still the same test that they need to employ;
 3
    meaning every officer has to run through the statute
    to see if the elements of a crime are met or
 4
 5
    compliance has been met.
              Was there a written definition of what
 6
 7
    constitutes a copy or duplicate prior to the Notice
    of Enforcement?
 8
 9
                    MR. PORTER: Objection.
               I don't recall what the statute says about
10
    copy or duplicate and how it uses that terminology,
11
    and I think that the federal -- I don't recall
12
1.3
    what's in the federal statute, but I do believe
14
    there may be use of the word "copy or duplicate" of
15
    any caliber, I think is the phraseology. So then
    obviously you have the tests about internal
16
17
    mechanisms and their shared features.
18
                    So, again, it's a difficult analysis,
19
    but it's an analysis that has to be done in order to
2.0
    determine if there was a violation.
2.1
              You said there was an internal analysis
22
    component. I don't want to put words in your mouth.
23
    What exactly did you mean with that?
24
         Α.
               Again, I haven't committed the statute to
```

```
memory. I thought -- I think, you know, again,
 1
 2
    there are enumerated banned weapons.
                                            There are
 3
    weapons that they share or have certain features and
    elements, they are considered banned, and then I
 4
 5
    believe a weapon is a copy, it's internal -- fires
    the same way as basically the same weapon, then it
 6
 7
    would also be banned or not banned based upon its
    shared features.
 8
               I'm going to hopefully provide more
 9
10
    structure to this.
11
                    MR. NARDONE: Can you mark this as an
    exhibit?
12
                    (Exhibit No. 8 marked for
1.3
    identification.)
14
15
    BY MR. NARDONE:
16
               If you can take a moment to refresh your
17
    recollection as to the actual statute in
18
    Massachusetts, which I believe is on Pages 1 and 2
19
    and maybe even some on 3 of this document. Let me
20
    know when you've finished looking at it.
               (Complies.)
2.1
         Α.
22
               Drawing your attention to Page 1, the
23
    bolded language in the first indented paragraph
24
    there. It says "or copies or duplicates of the
```

```
1
                    MR. PORTER: Exhibit 8?
 2
                    MR. NARDONE: Yes.
 3
         0.
               And we're going to go through these tests
    kind of seriatim. At the bottom underneath
 4
 5
    "quidance" it states that -- it provides a couple of
    tests for determining whether a firearm is a banned
 6
 7
    copy or duplicate, the first being the similarity
 8
    test.
 9
                    If you can take a second to read that
10
    and refresh your recollection, make sure you
11
    understand rather than reading it all for the court
12
    reporter.
               (Complies.) Okay.
1.3
14
               What does "substantially similar" mean in
15
    that test?
                    MR. PORTER: Objection to the form of
16
17
    the question.
18
               I don't know what it meant from the
19
    author. What it means to me is we're looking for --
20
    you know, in trying to determine a copy or a
    duplicate substantial similarities, and I think
2.1
22
    "substantial" would mean something that is not
23
    inconsequential or meaningless but relates to how
24
    the weapon is used, what its capabilities are, and
```

also, like I said, the internal structure and mechanism of the weapon. That's how I would interpret it.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

Q. What would a law enforcement officer look at to make that kind of a determination?

6 MR. PORTER: Objection to the form of the question.

the question. Again, I would say officers -- you know, they do receive a lot of training in the weapons. Some are more familiar than others, obviously, with certain weapons so they might have their own understanding. They might possess certain knowledge, but, again, they have to -- you know, if they're going to seize a weapon, they would have to have probable cause to believe. I'm not sure making an ultimate determination is the same as forming probable cause. So when an officer believes, based upon whatever information is available, they have a copy, they might appropriately seize the weapon and make an arrest, and that could later be determined by a ballistition or something that, you know,

You're wrong. This is entirely different. This is only capable of shooting, you know, one bullet at a time and it's not a banned weapon.

So there could be a follow-up to that 1 2 or there could be enough information available to 3 the officer either through observation evidence or 4 personal knowledge of the weapon to make that 5 decision. 6 Is there any written policy that officers 7 would employ to make these kinds of determinations? 8 Well, we do have written policies 9 10 involving probable cause. They're mostly guided by 11 Massachusetts case law and federal case law on that, 12 but it's pretty much the same for everybody. 1.3 order to make an arrest for a receiver you need to 14 have that probable cause to effectuate the arrest. 15 In reference specifically to probable 16 cause for an arrest of a possession of a copy or 17 duplicate, is there any policy for determining 18 substantial similarity that is employed by the 19 department? 20 Not that I am aware of. Α. You stated a little a bit earlier --2.1 0. 22 I should stop you, or I should qualify my 23 own statement. Are we talking about -- I mean, we

now have additional guidance here, so the department

would obviously follow the statute and utilize the 1 2 guidelines from the Attorney General in order to do 3 that, so now the test would be -- the department hasn't, I don't think, promulgated this as an 4 5 official policy, but it would certainly, as an agent of the Commonwealth, use the guideline for the 6 7 Attorney General to determine if they have a violation of the law. 8 Maybe I wasn't particularly clear there. 9 10 I was more focused than that. I get you would apply 11 this generally, but in applying the actual specific 12 test that's under similarity test, is there any written guidance to the officers on how to apply 1.3 14 that particular test? 15 No, not that I'm aware of. 16 I don't want to put any words in your 17 mouth, but I believe you said earlier one of the 18 factors an officer would use in making these 19 determinations is their training. 20 Are all officers trained on patrol rifles? 2.1 22 Α. No. 23 Are all officers trained on the internal Q. 24 components of the enumerated banned firearms?

```
1
         Α.
               Not to my knowledge.
 2
         Q.
               You would agree with me that the
 3
    individual officer's knowledge of the internal
 4
    workings of an enumerated firearm will vary from
 5
    officer to officer depending on their personal
 6
    experiences?
 7
                    MR. PORTER:
                                 Objection.
 8
               I think that's possible, yes.
         Α.
               So individual officers may use different
 9
10
    factors to come to a determination if there is
11
    probable cause for an arrest then?
12
                    MR. PORTER:
                                  Objection.
1.3
               Yes, I think I stated earlier, I think,
14
    every officer has to make their probable cause
15
    determination based upon what is presently
    observable in front of them and what they know.
16
                                                        So
17
    the tests for that varies based upon the
18
    circumstances they find themselves in.
19
               If you turn over to the next page of the
         Q.
20
    same document, Exhibit 8.
2.1
         Α.
               I'm sorry, where?
22
         Q.
               The next page.
23
                    MR. PORTER: What page?
24
               Page 4, Exhibit 8.
         Q.
```

in making that determination if you're dealing with a copy or a duplicate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

- Q. Do your officers receive training on the marketing of firearms?
- A. Again, as you phrase it, I would say possibly some do and some don't. I would say most don't.
- Q. The ones who do, what kind of training
  would that be?
- A. Again, prior to -- we have now a crime gun unit. Prior to that we had a firearms licensing unit. Individuals assigned to there are expected to be aware of and have knowledge specific to firearms laws and that may include some training in exposure to the marketing end or capabilities of certain weapons, that kind of thing.
  - Q. Do your patrol officers have that kind of training?
  - A. Not to my knowledge. Some may. It's a bit of an aside, but a lot of our officers have particular interests in certain things, such as firearms, and some of them do a lot of their own independent training and teach on the side. Some of them teach, you know, courses that -- either through